

REMARKS

Claims 3, 4, 6, and 23-25 are now pending in the application. Claims 4 and 23 are amended herein. Claims 24-25 are added herein. Support for the amendments and additions can be found throughout the application, drawings, and claims as originally filed and, as such, no new matter has been presented. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102 AND § 103

Claims 3 and 6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Davey in view of Applicant's Admitted Prior Art ("AAPA"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 3 calls for a hand saw comprising "a handle including a hand grip portion and first and second blade mounting portions ... and a blade adapted to be removably mounted to either of said first and second blade mounting portions..." Claim 3 further recites "...said first and second blade mounting portions each include a screw boss for receiving a blade mounting screw therein..."

The Examiner acknowledges that Davey fails to disclose blade mounting portions each including a screw boss (see page 3 of the Office Action). The Examiner states, however, that "it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide a boss with the Davey device for the purpose of guiding the fastener."

In contrast to the present application, however, it is an object of the Davey reference to provide a device “wherein the only movable part shall be the blade” (column 1, lines 7-8 of the Davey reference). As such, the blade of Davey “can be attached and detached without moving other parts” (see column 3, lines 60-61 of the Davey reference).

Applicants point to section 2145 of the MPEP: “It is improper to combine references where the references teach away from their combination. *In re Grasselli*, 713 F.2d 731, 743, 218 USPQ 769, 779 (Fed. Cir. 1983)”. Applicants submit that the Davey reference teaches away from combining the handles disclosed therein with “a screw boss for receiving a blade mounting screw therein” as specifically recited in claim 1 of the present application, as adding a screw boss to the Davey reference would provide for another movable part (a blade mounting screw), and it is an expressed object of the Davey reference to provide a handle and blade which can be attached and detached without moving other parts. Therefore, Applicants submit that the proposed combination is improper. Accordingly, for at least these reasons, Applicants submit that claim 3 is not obvious in view of the references and should be in condition for allowance.

Claim 6 depends on claim 3 and, therefore, for at least the same reasons, should also be patentable.

Claims 4 and 23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Davey (U.S. Pat. No. 2,017,895). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 4, as amended, calls for a hand saw comprising “a handle including a hand grip portion and first and second blade mounting portions ... each of said first and

second blade mounting portions including a screw boss...” Claim 4 further calls for the hand saw to include “...a blade removably mounted to one of said first and second blade mounting portions; and a blade mounting screw removably engaged with said screw boss of said one of said first and second blade mounting portions so as to couple said blade to said handle...”

As noted above, the Examiner acknowledges that Davey fails to disclose blade mounting portions each including a screw boss. Furthermore, Applicants submit that Davey also does not disclose a blade mounting screw as specifically recited in claim 4. Therefore, for at least these reasons and the reasons stated above with respect to claim 3, Applicants submit that claim 4 is not anticipated by the Davey reference and should be in condition for allowance.

Claim 23, as amended, calls for a hand saw including “. . . a handle including a hand grip portion and first and second blade mounting portions, said hand grip portion defining an inner surface . . .” and “. . . a blade removably mounted to one of said first and second blade mounting portions and extending in a first direction away from said handle . . .”. Claim 23 further recites “. . . wherein said inner surface of said hand grip portion is oriented at an acute angle relative to said first direction . . .”.

With reference to paragraphs 3-4 of the present application, the hand saw of the present application provides an improved configuration for flush cutting applications. For example, when the blade is mounted on the bottom portion of the handle, the hand grip portion of the handle is forwardly sloped relative to the blade. As such, during flush cutting applications (e.g., using the saw on the floor), if a downwardly angled force

toward the blade is applied to the handle, the downward component of the force acts to hold the blade flush.

In contrast to the present application, when the blade 11 of Davey is coupled on side C of holding means 12, handle 20 is oriented away from the blade 11. Applicants submit that this configuration is opposite the present application. Therefore, Applicants submit that Davey does not disclose a hand saw having a handle with the configuration specifically recited in claim 23 of the present application. Accordingly, for at least these reasons, Applicants submit that claim 23 is not anticipated by Davey and should be patentable.

Applicants, therefore, respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections.

NEW CLAIMS

Claims 24-25 are added herein for substantive consideration. Claims 24-25 depend on claim 4 and, therefore, for at least the reasons stated above with respect to claim 4, should also be patentable.

Furthermore, claim 24 recites "...wherein said blade is secured relative to said handle in each of a lengthwise direction of said blade, a widthwise direction of said blade, and a depthwise direction of said blade by a positive engagement of said blade with one or more of said handle and said blade mounting screw." In contrast, the Davey reference discloses that a frictional engagement of the handle and blade prevents relative angular movement therebetween (see, e.g., column 3, lines 49-51 of the Davey reference). As such, Applicants submit that Davey does not disclose the subject matter

specifically cited in claim 24 of the present application. For these additional reasons, Applicants submit that claim 24 should be patentable.

Accordingly, favorable consideration of claims 24-25 is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: October 25, 2006

Electronic Signature: /Ryan W. Massey/
Ryan W. Massey, Reg. No. 38,543

HARNES, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

RWM/DWH/sms